

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY (v.2)

DRAFT - NOT APPROVED BY COMMITTEE

HANFORD ADVISORY BOARD

RIVER AND PLATEAU COMMITTEE

August 8, 2001

Richland, WA

Topics in this Meeting Summary

Committee Business.....	1
DOE-RL Reorganization	2
Update – Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP).....	3
HAB Consensus Advice #110	4
Update on November National Groundwater Workshop Planning	4
Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement	5
Inspector General Report	5
Update on Central Plateau Issue Manager’s Meeting.....	7
Institutional Controls Plan	7
Update on K Basins	8
Update on Non-Destructive Assay 233 S.....	9
Allied Technology Group (ATG)	10
Visit from Assistant Secretary Jesse Roberson.....	12
Wrap Up.....	13
Handouts	13
Attendees.....	14

This is only a summary of issues and actions in this meeting. It may not represent the fullness of ideas discussed or opinions given, and should not be used as a substitute for actual public involvement or public comment on any particular topic unless specifically identified as such.

Committee Business

The committee adopted its June meeting summary. Vice-chair Susan Leckband explained that the purpose of the meeting was mostly to receive updates on issues and prepare for the September HAB meeting, at which the Tri-Party agencies will provide an update on the Tri-Party Agreement.

Four responses to past advice were distributed – two responses to budget advice (from the Department of Energy – Richland Operations Office [DOE-RL] and the Department of Energy – Office of River Protection [DOE-ORP]) and two responses about the B-Reactor (from DOE-RL and the Washington State Department of Ecology [Ecology]). Since the September HAB agenda includes time to discuss responses to advice, facilitator Ruth Siguenza recommended the appropriate issue managers read the responses and evaluate how they compare to the intent of the advice.

DOE-RL Reorganization

Beth Bilson, DOE-RL, explained that DOE-RL has reorganized to clarify responsibilities, provide focus, and ensure success. DOE-RL is pursuing two major cleanup outcomes – the River and the Plateau. Beth Bilson will be responsible for the issues and success of the River cleanup and Pete Knollmeyer will be responsible for the issues and success on the Central Plateau. Outlying projects, such as Spent Nuclear Fuel and the Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP) report directly to the Site Manager. There are minor changes in integration and safety, but the overall concepts of interdependency, small mission elements, and organization remain. In the future there will be contractual alignment reflecting the reorganization. The new contract for the River Corridor is an incentive fee contract, so there is more independence for the contractor.

Beth Bilson explained that work that was not happening in the 200 Area did move to the River Corridor. Arlene Tortoso, who worked on groundwater issues within Beth Bilson's previous division, is now split between the two groups. The same concept applies to the 618-10 and 11 Areas, which will be part of Pete Knollmeyer's division because they are not within the River Corridor project. These transitions will be made carefully.

Pete Knollmeyer explained which divisions have changed. The Waste Management Division picked up operation of PUREX tunnels and the Environmental Restoration activities on the Central Plateau. The Canyon Disposition Initiative will remain in the Waste Management Division, although the Canyons are in the Plateau Transition Division. He requested input from the HAB on how to avoid the potential for a disconnect.

The other side of Pete Knollmeyer's division is moving Material Disposition to the Plateau Transition Division. PFP and other deactivation facilities will remain on the Central Plateau. Traditionally DOE-RL's infrastructure division managed non-radioactive items (such as the dispositions of railcars and heavy equipment), but infrastructure and grounds and maintenance are within the Central Plateau Division.

Committee discussion

- A committee member commented that if the two new entities work together, there should not be any problems. Another committee member commented that typically she dislikes reorganizations, but in this case it seems clear that the two new divisions will work together.
- Who has the groundwater and vadose zone work? Pete Knollmeyer is responsible for input and remediation; Wade Ballard has the rest. Before the reorganization, Beth Bilson noted that the people characterizing the plume would remain unchanged.
- What is NFDI? NFDI is the National Facility Deactivation Initiative, which encompasses post-PUREX and B-plant deactivation. Beth Bilson and Pete Knollmeyer both do strategic management for NFDI, so DOE-RL receives a small amount of money for the site (\$500,000 - \$700,000).

- Will the new organizations be facility-oriented rather than goal-oriented? Pete Knollmeyer pointed out that the goals for each division are listed in italics on the handout describing the reorganization.

Update – Plutonium Finishing Plant (PFP)

Pete Knollmeyer announced that he would provide an update of activities at the PFP facility then discuss the public involvement information sessions required by the TPA.

Update

The PFP project has worked over 2 million worker-hours safely. About 309 containers have been fully welded and completed, which is about one-tenth of the job. They have completed packaging metals that stayed intact as metal and chunks of alloy, but have not packaged the oxides resulting from those metals and alloys. Last week they began packaging the 3013 oxides; alloys are due at the end of June. DOE-RL has already told the Defense Nuclear Facilities Safety Board (DNFSB) it will be late on the oxide portion, which has been further complicated by the moisture issue. The method DOE-RL had been planning to use (super critical fluid extraction) might not be allowed, due to errors at Los Alamos. The only other approved method is only useful on oxides of purity greater than 80%, so DOE-RL will process those, which should take until December. Unless another technique is approved by December, progress on the project will be slowed. However, it is likely that the Thermo-Gravimetric Analysis (TGA) method will be approved within the next 3-4 months. Overall, DOE-RL believes it can work around this setback and still meet deadlines.

To treat solutions, the PFP project is using magnesium hydroxide precipitation, but this resulted in four times more product than anticipated, which would extend the baseline. Using the oxalic acid precipitate process instead has resulted in a ten-fold reduction in precipitate, which is effectively two times less than the baseline, so the schedule can be recovered. They will probably not reach the December 2001 DNFSB deadline because the forecasted end date is July 2002.

The direct discard waste will be disposed at the Waste Isolation Pilot Plant (WIPP). Only a small fraction of plutonium, but a large portion of solutions could be sent to WIPP. There has been a small delay in the polycubes schedule because the same furnaces are used to treat solutions. However, DOE-RL will still meet the milestone. It is also on track with the residues. To pursue the solution Direct Discard, DOE-RL would negotiate a TPA milestone.

Committee discussion

- How many muffle furnaces are there? Five.
- There was a question about shutting down Savannah River. Pete Knollmeyer commented that DOE-RL does not want to rely on any schedule of shipping plutonium to Savannah River. DOE-RL is undertaking a study for vault protection on the site; it could get uncleared workers into PFP by shrinking the area around vault protection. Doing so may help beat the current baseline date of 2016.

PFP Public meeting

Pete Knollmeyer asked whether a presentation about PFP on Thursday night of the HAB meeting in September in Seattle could be agency sponsored. Gail McClure answered that the HAB would not sponsor such a meeting, but could encourage attendance. Ruth Siguenza explained that if the HAB sponsored the meeting, issue managers and the committee would need to be involved in setting it up. PFP Issue Manager Dirk Dunning commented that the PFP issue managers would take a tour of the facility next week, so that should allow enough time to complete any relevant committee work. HAB Chair Todd Martin commented that people are often very tired after a full day of the HAB meeting. Pete Knollmeyer suggested setting up a series of storyboards and video in a foyer so people can look through the information on breaks. The committee agreed to this and requested that the storyboards would be mentioned on the HAB agenda and announced in the packet. It was decided that such a meeting would be officially sponsored by the Tri-Party agencies in response to a request from the HAB.

Pete Knollmeyer announced that DOE-RL had produced a video and CD on PFP. He gave copies to the issue managers and promised to get copies to any other interested parties.

HAB Consensus Advice #110

The committee considered reissuing HAB Advice #110 again, since there is now a new Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environmental Management (Jessie Roberson replacing Carolyn Huntoon). The committee requested an update from the Tri-Party agencies and DOE-RL on any problems resulting from decision authority being held at DOE-Headquarters rather than at the field office level. Doug Sherwood, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), commented that he has not seen much of an effect; issuing the advice might be premature. The committee agreed that it was too early and to reconsider in a few months.

Update on November National Groundwater Workshop Planning

Gordon Rogers explained that Savannah River is sponsoring groundwater workshop for all the Site Specific Advisory Boards (SSAB) on November 9-10. The planning group has agreed on an agenda. A representative from DOE-HQ will review the groundwater problems at each site; then there will be time for reviews by attendees at each of the sites. There will also be exhibits and a briefing book. The planning group would like to have a 5-member panel discussion – composed of representatives from DOE, its contractors, federal and state regulators, and a stakeholder. They want nominations from each site. The facilitators will select the Panel members. The panel will address problems and serve as a basis for any conclusions or recommendations from the workshop. Dirk Dunning added that the workshop planners would like some big names (such as Jessie Roberson) to attend, but also have a discussion about what the sites have in common. He noted that this last idea was difficult since the sites range from arid to wet. At this stage, the HAB needs to submit nominations for the participants of the panel. Gordon Rogers

and Dirk Dunning requested that anyone interested in attending let them know. Hanford has money to send up to ten HAB representatives.

- The workshop should make it clear that there are facts that are NOT in common among the DOE sites.
- What outcomes will result from this workshop? Gordon answered that the results were not clear. Dirk Dunning thought the workshop was seeking directions on the national problem.
- Is the Subsurface Contaminants Focus Area (SCFA) actively involved in planning this conference? Not officially, but Gordon has made Arlene Tortoso aware of it.
- Are there any Long Term Stewardship implications or connections to a stewardship program? Yes. Clearly this would extend into stewardship at all the sites.
- Dib Goswami, Ecology, pointed out that the workshop is just on groundwater, not the vadose zone.

Solid Waste Environmental Impact Statement

Mike Collins, DOE-RL, announced that a draft of the solid waste Environmental Impact Statement would be available for public review in April 2002.

Inspector General Report

Todd Schrader, DOE-RL, presented an update on the General Accounting Office and Inspector General reports on the costs of Low Level and Mixed Low Level Waste Disposal. His presentation, based on one made by Karen Gueverra of DOE-HQ, focused on life-cycle costs and how it is determined who pays what. He distributed a handout copy of the presentation.

Currently decisions for waste disposal are made by the waste generator and depend on what is best for them in their fiscal year. He described how DOE decides waste disposal costs – no profit, taxes, or insurance are involved, so the DOE base costs are somewhat reduced. In the model, the life cycle costs are estimated then divided by the volume disposed. The difficulties in applying a commercial model to DOE are that it is unclear how to pro-rate things like roads, utilities, and other site services. In addition, DOE does not charge closure costs at all. Todd Shrader emphasized that this cost model is just preliminary and serves as a relative comparison; the next step is to collect data.

Doug Sherwood, EPA, questioned the cost estimate for putting caps on waste, especially in shallow trenches, such as in the low-level burial grounds. Todd Shrader and Karen Gueverra explained that the estimate of 40 cents per cubic foot takes into account the land acre cost and volume of waste disposed.

Todd Shrader emphasized that this model is not complete and accurate; it is still being developed. An important question to answer is: what costs should generator sites consider when making disposal site decisions? He noted that a key barrier to developing cost models is that most decisions are made for each fiscal year. Within the model, the

waste generator pays disposal costs, and it is forecast that one-third of the waste disposed of at Hanford is from offsite. The cost model examines whether it is more or less efficient to increase the waste volume; usually with higher volumes of waste the operation is less expensive.

Mike Collins emphasized that DOE-RL will keep the committee aware of details as they evolve.

Committee discussion

- A committee member commented that using the term “disposal” is misleading because the waste is stored in locations but questions remain about what happens to it while in the ground.
- The committee voiced support that DOE is attempting to figure out the cost process for waste disposal. Specifically, the HAB is concerned that offsite waste comes with the necessary funding.
- A committee member encouraged DOE to include in its cost estimate the variable costs and overhead elements like for roads, safeguards, utilities, which may only exist for that purpose.
- Max Power, Ecology, observed that it appears to make a difference whether the cost model answers the Inspector General (IG) or General Accounting Office (GAO) questions.
- How are you planning to deal with commercial vs. DOE waste? Karen Gueverra answered that when DOE issues this data call, it will consider the differences in costs to the generators, such as transportation and packaging differences. The analysis will also attempt to better define uniformity for life cycle disposal costs.
- How will waste acceptance criteria be developed? They will not be common among sites, since there are different climate and physical features to consider, but the process can be similar.
- A committee member commented that the GAO and IG reports are different. The GAO report examines cost models. In contrast the IG report examines removing barriers to disposal at DOE sites. The IG report proposes a change in the funding sources of disposal to encourage disposal at DOE facilities.

Committee Chair Pam Brown expressed the committee’s frustration with the delay in the Solid Waste EIS to Karen Gueverra. The committee is beginning to perceive that DOE-HQ policies or funding priorities are preventing progress. She urged DOE-HQ to consider the necessity of completing the Solid Waste EIS, since it provides the factual information required before proceeding with receiving other waste. In addition, the HAB has been on record for years saying that waste-generating sites should pay the life cycle costs for waste sent to Hanford; it is unacceptable to take away from our cleanup to pay for disposal of off-site waste.

Doug Sherwood, EPA, commented that this whole effort has centered on why Hanford and Nevada should accept low-level waste disposal in unlined burial grounds. He pointed out that a significant portion of the associated costs is for characterization and ensuring that the waste is indeed low-level. Yet, the cost of putting in a liner for the

Environmental Remediation Disposal Facility (ERDF) is not very high and most sites already have an ERDF. At Hanford one important lesson we have learned is that having our own waste disposal facility speeds cleanup.

Update on Central Plateau Issue Manager's Meeting

Issue Manager Dan Simpson distributed an issue manager team report, which summarizes the plan for the process to identify end states for the Central Plateau. The issue manager teams for both the Integrated Risk Assessment Issue and Central Plateau Issue attended a meeting on July 10th with contractor representative Moses Jarayssi of Bechtel, who is leading the effort to define the groundwater end states for the Central Plateau. There was considerable attendance by the regulators. The plan is for the group from Bechtel to produce three white papers that will identify the current status of this issue, what criteria/standards will be used to define end states, and what end states are appropriate and acceptable. The white papers should be produced this month then the working group plans to meet with the RAP committee in September for a more technical discussion of the white papers. By January or February there should be an agreement in principle to support TPA negotiations about end state criteria.

Ruth Siguenza pointed out that under HAB process, issue managers frame issues, which are then worked through the committee, so it is not appropriate for issue managers to comment directly on the white papers. Comments should come through the committee and HAB.

Institutional Controls Plan

Issue Manager Susan Leckband provided an update to the committee on Long Term Stewardship (LTS) and the Institutional Control (IC) Plan. At the recent LTS workshop in Colorado, it became apparent that INEEL is taking the lead on LTS policy issues. Preliminary draft guidance on LTS has been issued, and Susan felt it had gaping holes. She emphasized that the Long Term Stewardship issue is very closely tied to the 200 Area end state dialogue and the Solid Waste EIS. One important result from the LTS workshop was that Dave Geyser expressed his support to consider LTS implications prior to and during remedy selection.

Jim Daily, DOE-RL, is directing the DOE effort on the Institutional Controls Plan, which is part of the LTS plan. He offered copies of the IC document to interested parties, and then discussed the LTS plan. Because of resource restraints and a due date from EPA, DOE-RL had to complete the IC plan as a stand-alone document before the LTS plan. Now that the IC plan is complete, the team can work on the LTS plan. This is the first IC plan for Hanford. It includes background information on institutional controls, site-wide controls from a post-cleanup or CERCLA standpoint, and National Priority List (NPL)-specific institutional controls (Hanford has four locations on the NPL). The last section of the plan describes how signage for the 100 Area might be different from the site wide controls.

Two regulatory decisions are the drivers for the IC plan: both the 100 Area burial ground ROD and 300 Area ROD cited the need for an IC plan. In addition, all the good ideas generated during the two LTS workshops will be incorporated in the LTS plan. The IC plan is being mailed to the HAB for comments.

- Max Power, Ecology, suggested that over time, one hopes that LTS gets built into planning instead of being outside the system. However, there are concerns about the viability of institutional controls through time, which is why EPA started requiring more specific institutional controls. Sustainability is important when making the remedial decisions. He believes the IC plan is significant and hopes the committee can spend some time on it. Jim Daily commented that a feedback loop is built into the process through an annual audit of institutional controls. This includes a corrective action process, and the five-year CERCLA reviews. As long as hazards remain on the site, there will be a feedback loop to close holes. Susan Leckband assured Max Power that Dave Geyser left the LTS workshops with a clear understanding that the HAB expects codification of the LTS requirements.
- Does DOE-RL have a line item on the budget for institutional controls? Jim Daily answered that there are two stewardship PBSs. One starts in 2047 when cleanup is complete, and the other is a short term PBS in which DOE-RL can capture the resources.

Update on K Basins

Issue Manager Harold Heacock reported that he has been following progress at the K Basins for many years. There have been many changes on the project, but it finally appears to be making significant progress. A high point occurred when the first canister was filled last fall. He then introduced Stacy Helman and Paul Carter of DOE-RL, who made a joint presentation on the status of the K Basins project.

Steve Veitenheimer, DOE-RL, took over the Spent Nuclear Fuel project in June. The project is moving into operations mode, although there is still a lot of work to be done. The baseline operations for the multi-canister overpacks (MCO) can be perceived as a curve that increases steeply. Currently the fuel is being processed on manual processing tables, and the project continues to have equipment issues. Hopefully by this month, the project can achieve movement of 5-6 MCOs per month, although it will take a couple of months to achieve optimal speed. Operations and engineering staff are being brought into the project to achieve the goal of operating 24-hour shifts by December. DOE-RL has authorized overtime work to fill a few extra baskets per week.

At beginning of the year, Fluor was behind schedule but has since improved and is now only slightly behind schedule, although on track. There are no problems with the cost performance.

The new strategy involves increasing MCO throughput through the MCO Throughput Initiative (MTI), which is being tracked by DOE-HQ. Thus the focus is on the MTI and process improvements and acquiring additional casks and transporters. There are regular

status meetings to keep the contractor on schedule, and DOE-RL has incentivized its design-build contracts and is conducting much of the work out of house.

The New Fuel Process strategy addresses moving canisters from K East to K West. The schedule should beat the TPA milestone.

The status of the project is that 18 MCOs have been moved, and the project has logged over three million safe worker hours. Now the focus is on preparing T Plant to accept sludge from K Basins. Sludge water from K East will be loaded into containers and shipped to T plant. The sludge is kept in a slurry form, not treated, and contains about 40-50% water.

The Spent Nuclear Fuel project has learned many lessons. One new strategy is that every week DOE-RL managers travel to Seattle to oversee the design stage. They have already caught two different problems in the design stage. Also, the project is now designing simpler systems.

- Are you still on schedule to meet the TPA? Yes.
- The committee asked for explanation of the project's budget. Stacey Helman explained that the project's budget is \$1.7 million as a whole. The 2001 budget was slightly higher than projected, but has since decreased.
- What work is not being done if the budget is lower? DOE-RL used contingency funding. The BCR identified work scope in K East and replacing the fuel system in K West. The project is now doing the fuel transfer system and will hopefully gain back the sludge removal BCR. The overall project budget has not increased, but now there is no longer as much contingency available.

Update on Non-Destructive Assay 233 S

Phil Loscoe, DOE-RL, commented that the 233 S facility was built to concentrate plutonium solutions prior to being sent to PFP. After a fire, the facility was on a list for Decontamination and Decommissioning. Assays were conducted with a detector that senses gamma rays from Transuranic (TRU) elements and then calculates TRU activity. This detector helped distinguish between TRU and low-level waste. In May/June it was reported that the equipment was incorrectly calibrated, so for two years (from May 1999 to May 2001) that detector was used to classify waste with an incorrect calibration factor. Of the 232 items assayed incorrectly, roughly 108 were characterized as low-level waste, and those items have been put into ERDF. Currently DOE-RL is recovering that waste. Fluor Hanford will be able to reanalyze the data for those packages, since the original gamma spectra existed in data records.

DOE-RL is working closely with EPA on this error. Many items were classified as low-level waste but may not be. In some cases the detection limit was not high enough to determine what radioactivity was present. The options are to retrieve and reassay all the waste or to leave it where it is. This decision is for the EPA. DOE-RL would rather not retrieve the waste packages, since doing so runs the risk of damaging the protective

barrier. Bechtel knows where each waste package is buried. Also, since the problem was reported, no additional waste has been added to the area in question. The error is not an immediate threat to the environment or people.

Regulator Response

EPA

Doug Sherwood commented that EPA is anxiously awaiting the final data from DOE-RL and the contractors. The issue is what to do once the contractors reanalyze the data. The decision will be made at the top level of both DOE and EPA – the Secretary of Energy has to petition the EPA Administrator. The EPA ERDF Project Manager currently must approve any proposed shipments from building 233-S. Also, there are new capabilities in place to measure these items at 233-S, and EPA is reviewing other precautions very closely.

Committee discussion

- Isn't measuring equipment supposed to be calibrated on a regular basis? Phil Loscoe explained that there is no required calibration. The mistake was made during the initial calculation. Once the instrument has been calibrated appropriately and checked with a test source each day, there is no reason to suspect its calibration is off. The issue is not that the instrument was not calibrated frequently enough; it is that the calibration was not done correctly.
- Why weren't primary or secondary standards used? Doug Sherwood, EPA, commented that EPA and DOE-RL have discussed this issue repeatedly in great detail, and the issue always returns to whether the system itself was calibrated or whether the instrument was calibrated. The detector was not sensitive enough for how it was being used. Phil Loscoe commented that the equipment was off by factor of eight.
- What was the total volume? Potentially five boxes with dimensions of 4x4x8 feet. That means five cubic meters out of 300,000 meters disposed of in the last year.
- When the initial alpha survey was done, why wasn't the error partially determined? Doug Sherwood explained that alpha surveys cannot be used with material in pipes or plastics. The concern for the radiation in question is what contamination is in or on the material.

Allied Technology Group (ATG)

The Executive Issues Management Group (EIMG) assigned the ATG to the RAP committee as lead, and it cross cuts with the Budgets and Contracts Committee. The issue managers who attended a tour of the Allied Technology Group (ATG) facility the previous Tuesday reported what they had learned.

Gerry Pollet explained that the ATG issue was prompted by the HAB becoming aware of the commitments made at the Idaho Advisory Board that DOE had determined to send plutonium and TRU to the ATG facility in Richland for thermal treatment before being sent to WIPP. This issue is the subject of a lawsuit in Idaho. A citizens group in Jackson

Hole, WY (downwind of Idaho) sued DOE on the grounds that the waste could not be incinerated without an EIS. The lawsuit was settled (with lots of publicity) a year ago, and the waste will not be incinerated in Idaho. A citizen's advisory panel was also created and it determined that there are many non-incineration possibilities for INNEL's waste stream in question. There is a commitment to send the waste to ATG for thermal treatment, which is not a recommended treatment. There is no coverage under the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) for this.

One policy question is whether such wastes were covered under waste permits. Another concern was that ATG would be treating PCB-contaminated waste, which is an allowable technology, but there are good other onsite technologies. PCB incineration releases dioxins. Gerry Pollet expressed concern that ATG may have a license to thermally treat PCBs, which might be the thermal equivalent of incineration. He noted that the Idaho commitment was to not to incinerate the waste in Idaho, but apparently it is acceptable to incinerate it at ATG. This is a question of EIS coverage and permitting issues.

Other issues include advance payment to ATG for waste treatment work, contracting issues, and safety concerns. ATG has admitted it is millions of dollars in debt. There is a lot of waste onsite, and if ATG goes bankrupt, then the waste onsite becomes a State and DOE problem. ATG is essentially bankrupt and if it is not able to reorganize or achieve positive cash flow, what would happen?

Gerry Pollet reported that he was pleased with the tour of ATG, but disturbed that the vice president and site manager would not discuss the TRU waste from Idaho.

The committee discussed whether the issue was of HAB concern, since it may instead be a commercial issue of regional concern. Pete Knollmeyer recommended getting answers from Idaho. He added that ATG is not licensed to receive TRU. The issue managers said they had been informed that ATG does not look at whether the waste it receives is or is not TRU.

Pete Knollmeyer explained that DOE-RL has changed its policy on pay for performance. It made a business decision to advance cash for services that it still expects to receive. He admitted that DOE-RL took a risk by paying for the treatment of waste already delivered to ATG.

The committee identified the policy issue as the possibility that waste from another DOE site being sent to ATG for treatment might become the obligation of Hanford if ATG goes bankrupt. Pete Knollmeyer did not believe any waste from Idaho or Rocky Flats comes to Hanford. The committee requested to be informed if that changes.

Regulator Perspectives

Ecology

Jane Hedges, Ecology, commented that ATG's RCRA permit requires that the waste ATG processes goes back to its source. Any change in that procedure would constitute a permit change, and there would be an accompanying public process.

Fred Jamison, Ecology, explained that ATG's permit was issued in July 1999 following public comment. The permit issued jointly by EPA and Ecology because of the PCBs, and both agencies observe and monitor testing. The permit addressed the treatment of mixed low-level waste, which is why ATG had to meet EPA standards. Also, ATG does have a waste acceptance plan that prevents the acceptance of waste with activity levels above a certain level. The issue of concern to the HAB and TPA is that a September milestone exists for thermal treatment of low-level waste. It is in the interest of the regulating agencies and HAB that ATG be available for treating low-level and mixed waste. Fred Jamison distributed a letter he had written to George Sanders, DOE-RL, on this issue.

Washington State Department of Health (DOH)

Debra McBaugh, Washington State Department of Health (WDOH), explained that WDOH licensed the facility regarding the radionuclides. DOH cannot license for waste beyond TRU levels – those permits must go to the federal government. ATG has considered this option, but would rather be regulated by the State than the Nuclear Regulatory Commission. Until ATG changes its mind, it cannot receive material above a certain level. The surety mechanisms on the permit are strong, so it would be easy to ship material back to its source and decommission the site.

Committee discussion

Committee members disagreed on the level of involvement from the HAB. Some felt it was a private issue that the regulators are handling. Others saw a link to the TPA since Hanford cleanup budget and waste is being sent to ATG. It was pointed out that this issue made the front page of the *New York Times*, so the HAB should stay updated.

The committee decided to include the issue on its work plan under the Waste Management issue, noting that it cross cuts with the Budgets and Contracts Committee. Pete Knollmeyer clarified that updates about the transport of Hanford materials to and from ATG should be from DOE-RL. The regulators would provide updates on the status for the ATG testing. The two items of concern are the TPA milestone for Hanford thermal waste treatment and for the committee to hear a presentation from the regulators on what the permits cover. It was pointed out that the relevant regulator project managers would not be available in September, due to the trial burn at ATG.

Visit from Assistant Secretary Jessie Roberson

HAB Chair Todd Martin announced that the new Assistant Secretary of Energy for Environmental Management, Jessie Roberson, would be visiting Hanford next week. The HAB chairs and vice-chairs will have 45 minutes with her over breakfast. Todd proposed that HAB members identify issues to be included on the agenda and forward them to the

facilitators and committee chairs and vice chairs. The group meeting with Ms. Roberson will meet on Tuesday prior to the breakfast meeting on Wednesday.

Wrap Up

The committee rescheduled its committee call to occur before the Executive Issues Management Group call. The rescheduled call will occur at 9 am on August 14th and the committee issue representatives for the Executive Issues Management Group call will be Gordon Rogers and Dan Simpson.

At the September committee meeting, two hours were allocated to discuss the Central Plateau end states white papers. Members also wanted to discuss LTS, the public meetings about TPA negotiations for PFP (which may be an issue for the Public Involvement and Communication Committee), and an update on planning for the National Groundwater Workshop, and the National Facility Deactivation Initiative. In the interest of not being rushed and providing adequate time for dialogue, the committee decided it needs a full day in September.

Handouts

- River and Plateau Committee Agenda, August 8, 2001
- DOE-IG-0505 Audit Report: Utilization of the Department's Low-level Waste Disposal Facilities, May 2001
- DOE-RL-2001-41 Draft A Site Wide Institutional Controls Plan For Hanford CERCLA Response, July 26, 2001
- E-mail from Gerald Pollet re: ATG, July 16, 2001
- Letter from Fred Jamison, Ecology, to George Sanders, DOE-RL re: Request for Information and Documents Pertaining to Low Level Mixed Waste to be Treated at ATG
- Summary of 233-S Non Destructive Assay Issue, by Phil Loscoe, August 7, 2001
- Hanford Spent Nuclear Fuel Project Presentation, by Stacy Helmann, August 2001
- Letter from Carolyn Huntoon, Acting Assistant Secretary for Environmental Management, to Todd Martin, Chair of HAB, June 15, 2001
- 200 Area Central Plateau Issue Manager Draft Meeting Notes by Dan Simpson, July 10, 2001
- Presentation handout: Development of a Life-Cycle Cost for Low-Level Waste Disposal, August 8, 2001
- HAB Consensus Advice #110
- Assistant Manager for Central Plateau organizational chart, August 8, 2001
- Helen E. (Beth) Bilson, Assistant Manager for River Corridor, organizational chart, August 8, 2001
- Announcement from DOE-RL to all DOE-RL employees re: re-alignment of the Richland Operations Office, June 29, 2001
- DOE-ORP Response to HAB Consensus Advice #116
- DOE-RL Response to HAB Consensus Advice #119
- Ecology Response to HAB Consensus Advice #119
- DOE-RL Response to HAB Consensus Advice #120

Attendees

HAB Members and Alternates

Pam Brown	Shelley Cimon	Jim Curdy
Dirk Dunning	Gariann Gelston	Harold Heacock
Dave Johnson (phone)	Robin Klein	Susan Leckband
Todd Martin	Debra McBaugh	Maynard Plahuta
Gerry Pollet	Fred Roeck	Dan Simpson

Others

Beth Bilson, DOE-RL	Rick Bond, Ecology	Tom Logon, Bechtel Hanford
Paul Carter, DOE-RL	Dib Goswami, Ecology	Nancy Myers, Bechtel Hanford
Mike Collins, DOE-RL	Jane Hedges, Ecology	Todd Nelson, Bechtel Hanford
Pete Knollmeyer, DOE-RL	Fred Jamison, Ecology	Christina Richmond, EnviroIssues
Phil Loscoe, DOE-RL	Max Power, Ecology	Ruth Siguenza, EnviroIssues
Gail McClure, DOE-RL	Doug Sherwood, EPA	Rob Piipo, FH
George Sanders, DOE-RL		Barb Wise, FH
Todd Shrader, DOE-RL		John Stang, Tri-City Herald
Jon Yerxa, DOE-RL		
Karen Guevara, DOE-HQ		